

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

6 GLASKER JACKSON,)
7 Plaintiff,) No. 03:12-cv-00974-HU
8 vs.)
9 MULTNOMAH COUNTY, and MICHAEL D.) FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION
SCHRUNK, District Attorney,) ON INITIAL REVIEW OF
10 Defendants.) AMENDED COMPLAINT

13 Glasker Jackson
13901 S.E. Schiller Street
14 Portland, OR 97236

15 Plaintiff *pro se*

18 HUBEL, Magistrate Judge:

19 On June 25, 2012, I granted the plaintiff's application for
20 leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and performed an initial review
21 of the plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. I found
22 the plaintiff had failed to state claims against either of the
23 named defendants with sufficient clarity for the defendants to
24 respond. In the interests of justice, I allowed the plaintiff to
25 file an Amended Complaint, directing him, specifically, to state
26 the facts and legal basis for each claim he asserted against
27 Multnomah County, and against District Attorney Michael D. Schrunk.
28 See Dkt. #5.

1 On July 9, 2012, the plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint.
2 Dkt. #7. If anything, the plaintiff's claims are even less under-
3 standable in the amended pleading. In addition to repeating,
4 verbatim, the factual recitation from his original Complaint, the
5 plaintiff also asks a number of questions in the amended pleading
6 regarding procedures employed by the Multnomah County Circuit
7 Court, and by public defenders appointed by that court. None of
8 his questions clearly implicates any violation of the federal
9 Constitution or federal law.

10 The court must dismiss a *pro se* action on initial review, if
11 the court finds the plaintiff's claims are frivolous, fail to state
12 a claim for which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief
13 against a defendant who is immune from the requested relief. 28
14 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). I find the plaintiff in this case has failed
15 to allege sufficient facts to establish a violation of any federal
16 or constitutional law, and he therefore has failed to state any
17 claim against the two named defendants for which relief may be
18 granted. Accordingly, I recommend the case be dismissed.

SCHEDULING ORDER

21 These Findings and Recommendation will be referred to a
22 district judge. Objections, if any, are due by **September 7, 2012**.
23 If no objections are filed, then the Findings and Recommendation
24 will go under advisement on that date. Because the defendants have

1 not yet been served with process and have not, therefore, appeared
2 in the case, no responses to objections will be received.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated this 20th day of August, 2012.

5 /s/ Dennis J. Hubel

6

7 Dennis James Hubel
United States Magistrate Judge

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28